

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 19 are amended. Additionally, the title, abstract and specification are amended.

Applicants wish to extend their appreciation for the courtesies extended to their representative during the interview on August 26, 2004 (hereafter, the interview). During the interview, the discussion focused on claims 1 and 11. The comments below reflect that discussion and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action objects to claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 as based upon rejected base claims with included informalities but indicates that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 9 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and all intervening claims. Thus, according to the Office Action, claims 9 and 19 are allowable. Further, claims 10 and 20 now depend from allowable claims 9 and 19 and are, therefore, also allowable. Applicants respectfully request the objection to claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 define patentable subject matter. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-8 and 11-18 define patentable subject matter.

Item 1 of the Office Action objects to the title, abstract, description and claims due to the misuse of the word "complimentary" and requires substituting the word "complementary" as a correction. The title and abstract are amended in accordance with the Examiners suggestions in the Office Action. Further, paragraphs 4, 5 and 9 of the specification have also been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Finally, claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 are amended in accordance with the suggestions in the Office Action. Thus, all informalities with respect to misuse of the word "complimentary" have been eliminated. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title, abstract, description and claims due to the misuse of the word "complimentary" be withdrawn.

Item 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7, 11-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C.

102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5, 701,928 to Aoki (hereafter, Aoki). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended to recite, inter alia, --...the fuel tank and the filler tube being one piece.... rather than "the fuel tank and the filler tube integrated as one piece". As agreed during the interview, amended claims 1 and 11 define over the art of record. Aoki neither discloses nor suggests --the fuel tank and the filler tube being one piece--. Aoki merely discloses a fuel tank assembly of several pieces including fuel cylinders 10 and 11, charging pipe 38, charging valve 40, auxiliary unit 17 and a host of other assembled parts. Thus, in accordance with the interview, claims 1 and 11 define over Aoki. Further, claims 3-4, and 7 as well as claims 12-14 and 17 also define over Aoki as these claims depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and recite additional features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 11-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as anticipated by Aoki be withdrawn.

Item 5 of the Office Action rejections claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032818 to Clare et al. (hereafter, Clare et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the interview, amended claims 1 and 11 define over the art of record. Clare et al. does not disclose or suggest --...the fuel tank and the filler tube being one piece-- as recited in amended claims 1 and 11. Thus, in accordance with the interview, claims 1 and 11 define over Clare et al. Further, claims 5-6 and 15-16 also define over Clare et al. as these claims depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and recite additional features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Clare et al. be withdrawn.

Item 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Clare et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,357,618 to Kloess et al. (hereafter, Kloess et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Clare et al. discloses all recited elements except a fuel tank made of molded plastic. Applicants respectfully disagree. As demonstrated above, Clare et al. neither discloses nor suggests --...the fuel tank and the filler tube being one piece-- as recited in claims 1 and 11. Further, as agreed during the interview, Kloess et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature. Thus,

the combination of Clare et al. and Kloess et al. does not disclose or suggest every element of claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 8 and 18 define over the combination of Clare et al. and Kloess et al. as these claims depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and recite additional features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. (103(a) as unpatentable over Clare et al. in view of Kloess et al. be withdrawn.

Item 8 of the Ohe Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 7, 12-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Clare et al. in view of U.S. patent 5,673,940 to Gaisford et al. (hereafter, Gaisford et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Clare et al. discloses all elements of claims 1 and 11. Applicants respectfully disagree for reasons already stated above in Items 4, 5 and 7; according to the interview, amended claims 1 and 11 define over Clare et al. Further, as agreed during the interview, Gaisford et al. neither discloses nor suggests --...the fuel tank and the filler tube being one piece-- as recited in claims 1 and 11. Thus, the combination of Clare et al. and Gaisford et al. neither discloses nor suggests every feature of claims 1 and 11. It, therefore, follows that the combination of Clare et al. and Gaisford et al. cannot disclose or suggest every feature of either claims 2-4 and 7 or claims 12-14 and 17 as these claims depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and recite additional features. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-4, 7, 12-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Clare et al. in view of Gaisford et al. be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application defines patentable subject matter and is condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Hope W. Carter
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Hope W. Carter
Reg. No. 46,604
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4380

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on: 03 September 2004
Date

Hope W. Carter 9/3/2004
Signature Date